DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 463 582 EA 031 581

AUTHOR Rodriguez, Terry-Ann; Slate, John R.
TITLE Principals' and Teachers' Views of Site-Based Management in Texas.
PUB DATE 2001-11-00
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration (Cincinnati, OH, November 2-4, 2001).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Elementary Secondary Education; *School Based Management; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Texas

ABSTRACT

In this study, the views of Texas principals and teachers regarding the implementation of and support for site-based management were examined through a survey administered by the Texas Education Agency. A total of 2,128 respondents were queried regarding the implementation of and degree of support for site-based management. Analysis of responses to the survey items revealed statistically significant differences between principals' and teachers' perceptions in both areas assessed (implementation and support). Principals reported a higher degree of site-based management implementation and a higher degree of support for it than was reported by teachers. Findings are evaluated in connection with relevant literature. One possible reason for the differences in perception is that principals preferred to believe that more site-based decision-making was taking place on their campuses than actually was the case, or purporting site-based management implementation at higher degrees because they are aware of the consequences that could come from claiming the contrary. In contrast, teachers could have reported what actually does or does not take place at their campuses, regardless of consequences that may come from admitting limited degrees of site-based management. Research examining the relationship between the school leadership role and school effectiveness is suggested. (Contains 45 references.) (RT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Running head: PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER VIEWS OF SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT

ED 463 582

Principals' and Teachers' Views of Site-Based Management in Texas

Terry-Ann Rodriguez

Region 19 Education Service Center

John R. Slate

The University of Texas at El Paso

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. A. Rodriguez

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

EA031581

Abstract

In this study the views of principals and of teachers regarding the implementation of site-based management and the support provided for site-based management in the State of Texas were examined through a survey administered by the Texas Education Agency. Analysis of the survey items in which 2,128 respondents were queried regarding the implementation of site-based management and the degree of support provided for site-based management revealed statistically significant differences between principals and teachers in both areas assessed. Principals reported a higher degree of site-based management implementation and a higher degree of support for site-based management than was reported by the teachers. Findings are connected with the extant literature. Implications of our findings are discussed.

Principals' and Teachers' Views of Site-Based Management in Texas

Americans have been rethinking and redesigning the way in which public schools should be most effectively operated through the process known as restructuring or systematic reform (Fiske, 1995). One of the most frequently used approaches to school reform is site-based management (SBM) (Mohrman, 1994). The major objective behind the site-based management approach is to move decision-making control from the central office of a school system to the local school level (i.e., at each school campus) (Short & Greer, 1997). Critical to the implementation of site-based management is the participation of school stakeholders (i.e., teachers, parents, administrators, staff, and community and business members) in the decision-making process. Site-based management is intended to address the need to include those people closest to the problems, issues, and situations in decision- making at the local school level (Goodman, 1994). "Although site-based management appears in many guises, at its core is the idea of participatory decision making at the school site" (David, Dec. 1995/Jan. 1996, p. 6).

The impetus behind SBM in Texas came from Senate Bill 1 (1990), in which school improvement committees were mandated at the district and campus levels. These school improvement committees are to consist of an administrator, teachers, parents, and community members so that all stakeholders are represented in school decision making. Elementary, middle, and high schools are required to have SBM committees of this composition to be in compliance with the legislative mandate. Because of the increased local autonomy and accountability that is created through shared decision making, increased student achievement is cited as a positive outcome of SBM (TEA, 1992). However, limited research is available about the extent to which

site-based management has been implemented and the extent to which differences may be present between stakeholders such as principals and teachers in their views of site-based management implementation.

Theoretical Basis of the Study

Based on a critical theorist perspective of including a multiplicity of voices in decision-making, the implementation of site-based management should provide teachers and other stakeholders, who have not had as great a voice in decision-making in the past as have administrators, the opportunity to be given "a greater voice in the decisions that affect the school" (Carnegie Forum, 1986, p.24). In critical theory, a strong emphasis is placed on shared leadership and teacher empowerment. "An important aspect of empowerment is that it provides opportunities for teachers [and other stakeholders] to participate actively, openly, and without fear in the process of shaping and molding the vision of the school and its culture through iterative discussion" (Owens, 1998, p. 216). Such empowerment brought about through organizational effectiveness, as stated by Mohrman, Wohlsetter, and Mohrman (1994) was positively associated with stakeholder participation. "SBM means that school management tasks are determined according to the characteristics and needs of the school itself, and therefore, the stakeholders have greater autonomy and responsibility for the use of resources to solve problems and carry out effective education activities, for the long-term development of the school" (Cheng, 1996, p.44).

Empowerment Associated with Site-Based Management

Teacher and principal empowerment have great potential for assisting significant and enduring school improvement (Lagana, 1989). Empowerment is defined by Lagana (1989) as the "opportunity to take risks and to compete without repercussions of failure" (p. 52). Short and Rinehart (1992) suggested that empowerment is a process that includes collaborative decision making, teacher influence, professional autonomy, professional development opportunities, and a sense of self-efficacy. Empowerment facilitates growth for participants regarding decisions about their work and practice. Bredeson (1994) proclaimed that empowerment is autonomy that others recognize to be a progression, a sense of identity, an opportunity for autonomous professional behavior, and as a professional work environment. Finally, Lightfoot (1986) defined empowerment as "the opportunities a person has for autonomy, responsibility, choice, and authority" (p. 9). Lagana (1989) also stated that empowerment means loosening power over what people do, but increasing a wider span of control over information and outcomes. Empowerment connotes a focused process that entails detailed communication and training. Involvement is what initiates empowerment and partnerships.

Empowerment of teachers, parents, and the community has been linked to effective school practices. Bredeson (1989) claimed that such schools have a positive climate, commitment, professionalism, ownership of problems, and independent problem solving. In addition, he found a relaxing of the hierarchical lines of governance, an increase in teacher collaboration, and a willingness campus-wide for all voices to be heard. Bredeson (1995) described nine critical factors found in a school district regarding empowerment standards (p.8):

1. Empowerment was locally defined and was expressed in language and images that made it more concrete than abstract.
2. Levels of comfort with and readiness for empowerment matched school circumstances and individual capacity.
3. The modeling of behaviors consistent with professional empowerment norms started at the top, with the superintendent and other administrators.
4. Time and money were critical resources supporting empowerment.
5. Principals' and teachers' professional roles were greatly expanded both in and beyond the school.
6. Empowerment enhanced teachers' professional image and efficacy.
7. Empowerment tapped the oftentimes underused creative energies and expertise of teachers.
8. Trust and collegiality were norms that created and supported empowerment.
9. Shared power was power enhanced, not power lost.

Nias (1989) pronounced that teachers who have been given opportunities to enter into discussions with other teachers and administrators, assume leadership roles, and are included in developing polices, goals, and objectives for the school are also more of an influence outside the classroom. Kreisberg (1992) has placed teacher voice at the heart of teacher empowerment. He believes that empowerment breaks the isolation that generally surrounds teachers' professional experiences.

As teachers become more involved in the decision-making process, they gain more of a voice. Even as long ago as the late 1970s, participatory decision-making was taking place in schools across the United States. Crockenberg and Clark (1979) identified five levels of teacher involvement in shared decision-making:

1. Through recommendation, teachers advise the principal.
2. Representative teachers relay information to others regarding principal's decisions.
3. The principal consults with teachers before making decisions.
4. Stakeholders alter, approve, or reject the principal's decisions.
5. Teacher representatives are authorized to make decisions.

Crockenberg and Clark (1979) also noted that involvement of teachers and other stakeholders was limited by the nature of a particular issue, the degree to which teachers would be affected by the decision, and the teachers' willingness to take on the responsibility associated with shared decision-making. Allen (1993) conducted more recent research in which he found that even when teacher participation is encouraged within a school culture, not all teachers will accept the invitation to participate. He suggested that some teachers do not want to be involved in decision-making due to their philosophy regarding others' points of view, lack of interest in the issue under discussion, feelings of insincere invitation to participate, intimidation by others, lack of information available about a specific issue, and uncomfortableness with openly offering their opinions in the particular setting.

Legislation Behind Texas Site-Based Decision-Making

House Bill 2885 of 1991 (TEC Ch. 21, Sec. 21.931, 1991) specifically called for site-based decision making, with site-based decision-making committees in place at each school in Texas by September 1, 1992. The 1991 Texas Legislature mandated that all public schools be governed by campus-based decision-making committees that have control over budget planning, curriculum issues, staffing patterns, professional development, and school organization (TEC, 1991; Texas Center for Educational Reform, 1993). School reform efforts have focused on shared governance emphasizing decision-making at the local level by a leadership team consisting of various stakeholders such as administrators, teachers, parents, and community members (Candoli, 1991). Teachers are elected to the committee as representatives to be the voices of specific grade levels or content area departments. Site-based management was planned by the Texas Legislature to be a method of decentralization intended to improve schooling by the participation of all stakeholders in decision-making at a local level (Sclechty, 1997).

In 1995, the Texas Legislature revised the mandate to address complaints that the site-based decision-making committees had too much control over the operations of the school (Smith, 1998). In addition, Smith (1998) noted that parents believed they were being left out of the decision-making process, even though they were members of the site-based decision-making committee. Under the newly revised and more clearly defined legislation, the principal was named the decision maker on campus, and the site-based councils were to be advisory in nature to the principal (TEC, 1995). Furthermore, parents now had to account for half the membership on the committee (Smith, 1998). Despite the rules that are in place, the implementation of site-

based management varies from campus to campus across Texas. Though the principal is the decision maker of the school by law, the Texas Legislature did not intend for schools to be governed as dictatorships; the principal is to be an advocate for collaborative governance (Smith, 1998).

Purposes of the Study

Our purpose in conducting this study was twofold: (1) to determine the extent to which principals and teachers were in agreement regarding the degree of implementation of site-based management; and (2) to ascertain the extent of agreement between principals and teachers regarding the degree of support for site-based management.

Research Questions

The following research questions were addressed:

(1) What is the extent of agreement between principals and teachers regarding the degree of implementation for site-based management in Texas?

(2) What is the extent of agreement between principals and teachers regarding the degree of support for site-based management in Texas?

Methods and Procedures

Subjects

In 1999, the Texas Education Agency selected 204 districts and 600 campuses from 20 Education Service Center regions in the state of Texas. Both district-level planning and decision-making committee members and campus-level planning and decision-making committee members were surveyed. The committee members included teachers, principals, parents,

community members, and business members. In addition, 300 teachers not serving on planning and decision-making committees were selected for surveying. Of the 1,103 school districts in Texas, 204 district committees were surveyed for an 18% population sampling. According to Krathwohl (1997) and Babbie (1990), 10% of the population is an adequate sample size to represent the population. Approximately 2,000 surveys were sent by the Texas Education Agency to 204 school district central offices for completion by district level planning and decision-making committee members. Returned at the district level were 1,243 responses for a response rate of about 62%. According to Babbie (1990), "A response rate of at least 50% is adequate for analysis and reporting. A response rate of at least 60% is considered good." (p.182). Of the 7,228 campuses in Texas, 600 campuses were surveyed for an 8% population sampling. Approximately 6,000 surveys were mailed to 600 campuses for completion by campus level planning and decision-making committee members. Of the campus level surveys mailed out, 1,779 responses were received for a response rate of about 30%.

Instrument

In accordance with § 11.254 (b) of the Texas Education Code, the Texas Education Agency must conduct an annual survey on district and campus-level planning and decision-making. The survey designed by the Texas Education Agency (1999) was given to members of district and campus-level planning and decision-making committees and 300 teachers not serving on a planning and decision-making committee. The survey consisted of 73 questions related to site-based decision making, to include implementation, training for committee members, stakeholder involvement, support, and planning. Responses available to choose from were

designed in the form of a Likert scale. Rensis Likert identified a range of management styles after researching in schools and industrial organizations for over 30 years (Owens, 1998). According to Owens (1998), these management styles are set on a scale from 1 through 4, with 1 being the least effective organizational environment and 4 being the sought after participative level. The survey conducted by TEA used the lower number of the scale as an indicator of the most effective management style.

A Cronbach's coefficient alpha was conducted to test the internal consistency of the survey instrument items 46-59 for all respondents. A correlation for all respondents was positive at and above .56 with a Cronbach's coefficient of .94, which meets the acceptable level of .70 for research purposes (Krathwohl, 1998). Further analysis was conducted to determine internal consistency for principal and teacher responses. Tests were also conducted to determine the internal consistency of items 46-59 regarding the responses of principals and teachers. Principal correlations were positive at and above .58, with a Cronbach's coefficient alpha of .94. Teacher correlations were positive at and above .54, with a Cronbach's coefficient of .94.

A Cronbach's coefficient alpha was conducted to determine the internal consistency of survey items 66-73 for all respondents. A correlation for all respondents was positive at and above .61 with a Cronbach's coefficient alpha of .90. Further analysis was conducted to determine internal consistency for principal and teacher responses. Items 66-73 related to support for site-based management within educational regions. Principal correlations were positive at and above .63, with a Cronbach's coefficient alpha of .90. Teacher correlations were also positive at

and above .60, with a Cronbach's coefficient alpha of .90. Thus, the internal consistencies of the survey for each area were all above the level needed for research purposes.

Procedure

The Texas Education Agency mailed the surveys to the randomly selected campuses and district offices May 1999. District and campus-level planning and decision-making committee members and 300 teachers not serving on a planning and decision-making committee completed the surveys. Upon completion, the campuses and district offices mailed the surveys back to the Texas Education Agency by the middle of September 1999. For the purposes of this study, we analyzed the responses to the survey as they related to the designated research questions to be answered.

Results

In research question one, the extent of agreement between principals and teachers regarding the degree of implementation of site-based management was addressed. Frequencies pertaining to the extent of agreement between principals and teachers regarding the degree of implementation for site-based management in Texas was determined and is reported in Tables 1 and 2.

Insert Tables 1 and 1 here

Means and standard deviations regarding responses from principals and teachers to the degree of site-based management implementation in Texas were calculated and are reported for survey items 46-59 in Tables 3 and 4.

Insert Tables 3 and 4 here

Based upon analysis of responses to survey items 46-59, 65.3% of principals surveyed indicated a high degree of site-based decision-making committee involvement regarding establishing and reviewing the campus improvement plan, and 22.4% of the principals reported adequate involvement. Only 9.6% of principals reported limited or no involvement. Of the teachers who responded to the survey, 62.0% indicated a high degree of involvement, and 25.0% of teacher respondents reported adequate involvement. Teachers indicated limited or no involvement by 10.3% of the respondents.

Regarding setting campus goals and objectives, 58.4% of principals surveyed indicated a high degree of committee involvement, and 30.1% indicated adequate involvement by the committee. A mere 7.7% of principals indicated limited or no involvement. Teachers surveyed showed a high degree of involvement by the site-based committee regarding campus goals and objectives by 59.7% of the respondents, whereas 26.5% pointed out adequate involvement. Teachers indicated that 11.3% of them believed limited or no involvement was present.

The annual evaluation of campus performance by the site-based committee was indicated by 47.0% of principals to be at a high degree of involvement, and 36.5% of principals surveyed

indicated adequate involvement. Limited or no involvement was pointed out by 12.3% of principal respondents. According to 46.4% of teachers surveyed, a high degree of involvement takes place in the evaluation of campus performance, and adequate involvement was indicated by 30.4% of teacher respondents. However, 18.5% indicated limited or no involvement by the campus committee, which is different than principals' responses.

Indicated by 21.0% of principals surveyed was a high degree of involvement by the site-based decision-making committee regarding the development of the campus budget, whereas 28.3% of principals reported adequate involvement. Notably, 46.1% of principals agreed that limited or no involvement by the decision-making committee exists. A high degree of involvement in campus budget development was reported by 15.9% of teachers surveyed, and 22.6% of those teachers surveyed indicated adequate involvement. Also reported by over half of teachers was limited or no committee involvement.

Site-based decision-making committee involvement in developing and revising curriculum was reported by 22.8% of principals to be at a high degree, whereas 37.0% indicated adequate involvement. A limited degree of involvement or no involvement at all was indicated by 35.6% of principal respondents. A high degree of committee involvement in curriculum issues was perceived by 22.9% of teachers surveyed and by 28.0% of teachers at an adequate degree. Limited or no involvement was indicated by just over 43% of teacher respondents.

Monitoring of student services such as counseling, nursing, and nutrition by site-based decision-making committees was reported by 11.9% of principals to be at a high degree of involvement, whereas 34.7% of principals surveyed indicated adequate involvement. Limited or

no involvement was perceived by 46.6% of principal respondents. A high degree of involvement was reported by 13.4% of teachers surveyed, and 24.5% of teachers indicated adequate involvement. Limited involvement or no involvement at all was reported by more than half of teacher respondents.

According to 13.7% of principals surveyed, a high degree of committee involvement in decisions regarding the monitoring of instructional support services (e.g., library/media, technology) was reported, whereas 39.3% conveyed adequate involvement. A limited degree or no degree of involvement was reported by 42.0% of principal respondents. Of teachers surveyed, 16.9% reported high involvement by the committee, 29.3% of teachers indicated adequate involvement, and almost 46% of teachers surveyed perceived limited to no involvement by campus committees.

A high degree of involvement by campus committees in evaluating and modifying instruction for students served under special programs was reported by 21.9% of principals, and 37.0% indicated adequate involvement. Limited or no involvement was pointed out by 36.5% of the principals. Teacher respondents indicated a high degree of involvement by 22.6% of those persons surveyed, and 24.9% reported adequate committee involvement. Over 44% of teachers answered that limited or no involvement of the committee was present.

Principals surveyed implied a high degree of site-based involvement regarding evaluation and modifying of facilities for students served by special programs by 15.5% of the respondents, whereas just over 31% indicated adequate committee involvement. Almost half of the principals surveyed reported limited or no involvement by the campus committee. Teachers indicated that

17.4% of them had seen a high degree of involvement regarding such evaluation and modification, and over 25% of teachers surveyed pointed out adequate committee involvement. However, teachers also reported limited to no involvement by the campus committee by almost half the respondents.

According to 17.8% of principals surveyed, a high degree of committee involvement existed regarding reviewing and recommending staffing patterns, whereas just over 33% of principals who responded indicated adequate involvement. A little over 40% of principals reported limited or no involvement by the campus committee. Teachers indicated a high degree of involvement in decisions about staffing patterns by 15.4% of the respondents, just over 24% of teachers reported adequate involvement, and exactly half of them conveyed limited or no committee involvement.

Recommending campus level staff development by the site-based committee was regarded at a high degree by 38.4% of principals who answered and at an adequate degree by just over 36% of them. A limited degree of involvement or no involvement at all was perceived by almost 22% of principals. Teachers indicated a high degree of campus committee involvement by 32.8% of the respondents, and almost 31% of the teachers surveyed implied adequate involvement. Limited or no committee involved was viewed by just over 31% of the teachers.

According to just over 17% of the principals who responded committee involvement in the reviewing and revising of campus organization occurred at a high degree, whereas almost 34% of principals viewed involvement at an adequate degree. A large 44% indicated limited or no involvement by the site-based decision-making committee regarding campus organization.

Teachers' responses were similar with almost 19% indicating a high degree of committee involvement and 25.8% reporting adequate involvement. Again, a large number of teacher respondents, 45.5%, reported limited or no involvement in campus organizational decisions by the site-based committee.

Reviewing and revising campus student codes of conduct was reported by 33.3% of principals to be at a high degree of involvement by the site-based decision-making committee, and almost 35% of principals indicated adequate involvement. Limited or no involvement was reported by just over 28% of the principals surveyed. A high degree of committee involvement regarding student codes of conduct was indicated by 30.7% of teacher respondents, and 29.5% implied adequate involvement. A total of just over 33% of teacher respondents reported limited or no committee involvement.

According to 35.2% of principals who responded, a high degree of involvement existed by the decision-making committee in keeping the community informed of campus performance and campus performance objectives, and 37.0% of principals indicated adequate involvement. Limited or no involvement by the committee was viewed by almost 24% of responding principals. Teachers' responses were comparable with 33.4% indicating high involvement and 32.6% of respondents showing adequate committee involvement in community communication. Limited or no involvement was reported by just over 26% of teacher respondents.

A MANOVA of principal and teacher responses indicated that principals perceived a higher degree of site-based management implementation than did teachers, Roy's Largest Root, $(14, 2113) = 2.87$, $p < .001$, with a small effect size of .14 (Cohen, 1988). Follow-up univariate

ANOVAS were examined for each of the 14 site-based management implementation items. The mean scores among items of implementation were statistically significant regarding evaluating campus performance, $F(1, 2126) = 6.16$, $p < .02$; developing campus budget, $F(1, 2126) = 21.89$, $p < .001$; developing and revising curriculum, $F(1, 2126) = 7.18$, $p < .008$; monitoring student services, $F(1, 2126) = 9.49$, $p < .003$; monitoring instructional support, $F(1, 2126) = 6.92$, $p < .01$; evaluating and modifying special education instruction, $F(1, 2126) = 11.54$, $p < .002$; evaluating and modifying facilities for special programs, $F(1, 2126) = 4.81$, $p < .03$; reviewing and recommending staffing patterns, $F(1, 2126) = 21.85$, $p < .001$; recommending campus level staff development, $F(1, 2126) = 13.24$, $p < .001$; reviewing and revising campus organization, $F(1, 2126) = 8.29$, $p < .005$; reviewing and revising campus student codes of conduct, $F(1, 2126) = 9.41$, $p < .003$; and keeping the community informed of performance and objectives, $F(1, 2126) = 5.44$, $p < .03$. The exceptions were the degree of the site-based decision-making committee's involvement in establishing and reviewing the campus improvement plan, $F(1, 2126) = 1.91$, $p > .05$ and setting goals and objectives, $F(1, 2126) = 1.26$, $p > .05$. Using Cohen's criteria, the effect sizes were all small, evaluating campus performance (.05), developing campus budget (.10), developing and revising curriculum (.08), monitoring student services (.06), monitoring instructional support (.05), evaluating and modifying special education instruction (.07), evaluating and modifying facilities for special programs (.04), reviewing and recommending staffing patterns (.10), recommending campus level staff development (.07), reviewing and revising campus organization (.06), reviewing and revising student codes of conduct (.06), and keeping the community informed on performance

and objectives (.05). Overall, principals indicated a higher degree of site-based management implementation than teachers based on univariate analyses of variance for the 14 survey items.

In research question two, principals and teachers were asked about support for site-based management in Texas. Means and standard deviations regarding responses to support for site-based management in Texas from principals and teachers were calculated and are reported for survey items 66-73 in Table 5.

Insert Table 5 about here

A MANOVA of data from principals and teachers indicated that principals perceived a higher degree of support for site-based management than teachers perceived, Roy's Largest Root, (9, 2066) = 5.25, $p < .001$, with a small effect size of .14 (Cohen, 1988). Accordingly, univariate analyses of variance were examined for each of the eight areas of support. The mean scores among the areas of support were statistically significant regarding support from the board of trustees, $F(1, 2074) = 31.68$, $p < .001$, with an effect size of .12; support from the superintendent, $F(1, 2074) = 26.00$, $p < .001$, with an effect size of .11; support from central office staff, $F(1, 2074) = 22.01$, $p < .001$, with an effect size of .11; support from campus principal, $F(1, 2074) = 13.77$, $p < .001$, with an effect size of .08; support from parents, $F(1, 2074) = 14.11$, $p < .001$, with an effect size of .08; support from community patrons, $F(1, 2074) = 16.25$, $p < .001$, with an effect size of .09; and support from business, $F(1, 2074) = 17.89$, $p < .001$. The exception was support for site-based management from teachers, $F(1, 2074) = 2.25$, p

> .05. Using Cohen's criteria, the effect sizes were small for all items, support from board of trustees (.12), superintendent (.11), central office staff (.11), campus principal (.08), community parents (.08), community patrons (.09), and business (.10). Based upon univariate analyses of variance for the 8 support survey items, principals indicated a higher degree of support for site-based management than did teachers.

To condense the results for research question two from principals and teachers serving on site-based decision-making committees, principals indicated a higher degree of site-based management implementation at campuses than teacher respondents. Survey responses from principals also revealed a perceived higher degree of support from the eight support sources for site-based decision-making compared to teachers' responses.

Discussion

This study was guided by two research questions. First, what is the extent of agreement between principals and teachers regarding the degree of implementation for site-based decision-making? Frequencies of responses from the 2,128 principals and teachers for survey items related to implementation of site-based management indicated that principals perceived a higher degree of site-based management at their respective campuses than did the teachers at those campuses. Second, what is the extent of agreement between principals and teachers regarding the degree of support for site-based decision-making? Regarding support survey items for site-based management as answered by 2, 074 principals and teachers, principals again indicated a higher degree of support from the eight support sources.

Principal and teacher responses were in agreement with existing literature and research. Teachers reported a lower degree of committee involvement than principals on 10 of the 14 survey items regarding implementation of site-based management. Principals and teachers disagreed by 12%, the largest gap between the two groups, regarding staffing patterns. To be highly decentralized, Lindelow (1981) suggested that a district must give schools full control over hiring staff and faculty. Wohlstetter and Mohrman (1993) claimed that the most effective school councils were given control over hiring and firing staff and faculty, including the principal.

Similar responses by both groups, yet still indicative of a perceived lower degree of implementation by teachers, were reported for evaluation of campus performance, budget development, developing and revising curriculum, monitoring student services, monitoring instructional support services, recommending staff development, reviewing and revising school organization, reviewing and revising student codes of conduct, and keeping the community informed of performance and performance objectives. Higher percentages of involvement were indicated for evaluation of campus performance, development and revision of curriculum, recommending staff development, reviewing and revising student codes of conduct, and keeping the community informed. A reason for the higher percentage of committee involvement in these areas could be due to the specificity of the law (TEC, 1995) regarding these items. Furthermore, principals may feel a little more comfortable with sharing power in these areas, because they are likely to be areas in which teachers have been provided training (Lonnquist & King, 1993). Support services and monitoring of facilities for students in special programs are likely not areas

teachers have been afforded training due to the specialized nature of special education. Budgeting and school organization were reported by principals and teachers to be the areas of least site-based decision-making committee involvement. Many districts may not have decentralized budgets to schools yet, which would mean the principal is not able to empower teachers to make budget decisions (Hill & Bonan, 1991). Again, the issue of willingness to equalize the authority of teachers and administrators may play a part in the low percentage of committee involvement (Blasé & Blasé, 1994). Training may also be lacking for both principals and teachers in these areas. Myers and Stonehill (1993) suggested that training should be provided to both principals and committee members during the early implementation stages of site-based management. Also to be considered are the demands placed on teachers with site-based management. Budgeting and school organization place increased time demands on committee members; therefore, many teachers may not wish to be involved to such a high degree as is consistent with the findings of Liontos (1994).

A possible explanation for the more positive response from principals than from teachers could be that principals believe that having a site-based decision-making committee makes their schools site-based, whereas teachers may not view the mere establishment of a site-based decision-making committee as actively implementing site-based management. Supported by the findings of Hatry et al. (1993), teachers believed site-based management had been implemented in their schools in name only, with principals unwilling to empower other interested stakeholders to make important decisions (Brown, 1990). Many principals may also claim to be actively implementing site-based management at their campuses due to the state mandate to do so, but

whether the implementation is legitimate or merely for outward appearances remains to be answered by future research.

Regarding support survey items 66-73, principals claimed a statistically significant higher degree of support than teachers for site-based management for all eight items. A possible explanation for these results is that principals liked to believe more site-based decision-making was taking place at their campuses than actually was taking place, as was discussed previously. Thus, the natural inclination may be to claim to have the support of stakeholders for site-based management, even if the support is not actually present. Such leadership could be consistent with what Easton, Flinspach, O'Conner, Paul, Qualls, and Ryan (1993) referred to as limited governance, where the principal is unwilling to listen to the voices of other stakeholders and uses the site-based decision-making committees as "rubber stamp committees" for his or her own agenda (p.83).

The difference between principal and teacher responses regarding site-based management implementation raises some questions. Principals indicated a higher degree of implementation than teachers, which could suggest that principals are merely purporting site-based management implementation at higher degrees because they are aware of the consequences that could come from not claiming to be a site-based campus. Senate Bill 1 may be driving their spoken words more than their actions (TSB, 1990). On the other hand, principals claiming higher degrees of implementation may truly believe it to be so, but are oblivious to what teachers actually perceive to be happening (Blasé & Blasé, 1997). Another possibility is that teachers were reporting what

actually takes place or does not take place at their campuses, regardless of consequences that may come from admitting limited degrees of site-based management.

A question to be answered is whether students who attend schools that implement the site-based decision-making model receive a better education than students who attend schools that follow the traditional model. To relate any student success to site-based management, researchers will need to enter these schools to view student performance documentation and to conduct interviews with teachers, administrators, parents, community and business members, and students who are serving on decision-making committees to question their perceived individual involvement on the committee, site-based decision-making training they have had, and their beliefs about the overall effectiveness of site-based management. In addition, non-committee members should also be interviewed to learn of their perceived notions regarding committee involvement, training, and overall effectiveness of site-based management. The qualitative research aspect of site-based management has been explored minimally at best. Because site-based decision-making relies heavily on the collaboration of all stakeholders, analysts of site-based management would be remiss to make judgments regarding its success or failure based solely on quantitative data without also considering qualitative research findings. In addition, schools not implementing site-based management will also need to be qualitatively studied for comparison to those schools operating under site-based decision-making.

Theory behind site-based management also generates implications for future research. School leadership is completely different using the site-based decision-making model; therefore, "layered leadership" (p.183) should be an important research focus (Cheng, 1996). Such

leadership could be empirically examined related to its contribution to school culture, school development, and school effectiveness at varying school levels. Furthermore, a close investigation of the relationship between the school leadership role and the model of school effectiveness at not only a state level but also a national level could aid in the improvement of effective leadership.

Finally, the point behind site-based management is to empower teachers and other stakeholders through authority, flexibility, and resources to work towards solving problems particular to their campuses and students. Site-based management does not call for a rigid set of rules (David, 1989). School autonomy is the key to successful change, and district level support is essential to aiding such change. Autonomy can be increased through customs and philosophy established by district leaders to include school boards and superintendents. Site-based management also takes time to implement, therefore districts and schools should plan for lasting incremental improvements over time, while including all stakeholders in those plans for the most effective outcomes of a site-based managed educational system.

References

Allen, L. (1993). The role of voice in shared governance: A case study of a primary school. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens. In J. Blasé, & J. Blasé. *The fire is back! Principals sharing school governance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Babbie, E. (1990). *Survey research methods.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Inc.

Blasé, J., & Blasé, J. (1994). *Empowering teachers: What successful principals do.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Blasé, J., & Blasé, J. (1997). *The fire is back!: Principals sharing school governance* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Bredeson, P. V. (1989). Redefining leadership and the roles of school: Responses to changes in the professional work life of teachers. *High School Journal, 23 (1),* 9-20.

Bredeson, P.V. (1994). Empowered teachers- empowered principals: Principals' perceptions of leadership in schools. In N.A. Prestine & P.W. Thurston (Eds.) *Advances in educational administration* (Vol. 3, pp. 195-220). Greenwich, CT:JAI.

Bredeson, P. V. (1995, April). *From gazing out the ivory tower to heavy lifting in the field: Empowerment through collaborative action research.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Brown, D. J. (1990). *Decentralization and site-based management.* London: Falmer.

Candoli, I.C. (1991). *School system administration: A strategic plan for site-based management.* Lancaster, PA., Technomic Publishing Co.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century.* New York: The Forum.

Cheng, Y. C. (1996). *School effectiveness and school based management: A mechanism for development.* The Falmer Press.

Clune, W.H., & White, P.A. (1988). *School-based management: Institutional variation, implementation, and issues for further research.* New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Policy Research in Education.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.).* New York: Academic Press.

Crandall, D. and Associates. (1982). *People, policies, and practice: Examining the chain of school improvement.* Andover, MA: The Network.

Crockenberg, V., & Clark, W. W. (1979). Teacher participation in school decision-making: The San Jose teacher involvement project. *Phi Delta Kappan, 61 (2),* 115-118.

David, J. L. (1995/1996). The who, what, and why of site-based management. *Educational Leadership, 53 (4),* 4-9.

Easton, J., Flinspach, S. L., O'Conner, C., Paul, M., Qualls, J., & Ryan, S. P. (1993). *Local school council governance: The third year of Chicago school reform.* Chicago: Chicago Panel on Public School Policy and Finance.

Fiske, E.B. (1995). *Systematic school reform: Implications for architecture.* In A. Meek (Ed.) Designing places for learning. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, pp.1-10.

Ganopole, S. J. (1991, April). *A comparison of public and private school principals' perceptions of and attitude toward teacher participation in the management of schools.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Goodman, J. (1994). External Change Agents and Grassroots School Reform: Reflections from the Field. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 9 (2),* 113-135.

Hatry, H.P., Morley, E., Ashford, B., & Wyatt, T.M. (1993). *Implementing school-based management: Insights into decentralization from science and math departments.* Washington DC: The Urban Institute.

Hill. P. T., & Bonan, J. (1991). *Decentralization and accountability in public education.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Krathwohl, D. R. (1997). *Methods of educational and social science research: An integrated approach.* New York: Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers, Inc.

Kreisberg, S. (1992). *Transforming power: Domination, empowerment, and education.* Albany: State University of New York.

Lagana, J. F. (1989, September). Managing change and school improvement effectively. *NASSP Bulletin, 73 (518),* 52-55.

Lightfoot, S.L. (1986). On goodness in schools: Themes of empowerment. *Peabody Journal of Education, 63 (3),* 9-28.

Lindelow, J. (1981). School-based management. In Smith, S. C., Mazzarella, J. A., & Piele, P. K. (Eds.) *School leadership: Handbook for survival.* Eugene: University of Oregon, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Liontos, L. B. (1994, March). *"Shared decision- making."* Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. ED 368 034.

Lonnquist, M. P., & King, J. A. (1993, April). *Changing the tire on a moving bus: Barriers to the development of professional community in a new teacher-led school.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

Mohrman, S. (1994). *School based management.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mohrman, S., Wohlstetter, P, & Mohrman, A. (Eds.) (1994). *School based management: Organizing for high performance.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Myers, D., & Stonehill, R. (1993, January). School-based management. *Education Consumer Guide, No. 4,* Office of Research, Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) of the Department of Education. ED/OERI 92-38.

Nias, J. (1989). *Primary teachers talking.* London: Routledge.

Owens, R. G. (1998). *Organizational behavior in education.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Schlechty, P.C. (1997). *Inventing better schools: An action plan for education reform.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Short, P.M., & Greer, J. T. (1997). *Leadership in empowered schools: Themes from innovative efforts.* Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Short, P. M., & Rinehart, J. S. (1992). School participant empowerment scale: Assessment of level of empowerment within the school environment. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 52 (4),* 951-960.

Smith, S. (1998). School by school: How site-based management is transforming education in Austin. *The American School Board Journal, 185,* 22-24.

Texas Center for Educational Research (1993, February). *A decade of change: Public education reform in Texas 1981-1992.* Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas at Austin.

Texas Education Agency (1992, January). *Resource guide on site-based decision making and district and campus planning.* Austin, TX. (II-1).

Texas Education Agency (1999). *District and campus-level planning and decision-making survey.* Austin, TX.

Texas Education Code. (1991). Chapter 21, Section 21.931.

Texas Education Code. (1995). Chapter 11, Section 11.251.

Texas Senate Bill 1, (1990). 71st Legislature, 6th called session.

Wohlstetter, P., & Mohrman, S. A. (1993, January). *School-based management: Strategies for success.* New Brunswick, NJ: CPRE Finance Briefs.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche, or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: Terry-Ann Rodriguez	Printed Name/Position/Title: Terry-Ann Rodriguez, Ed.D.
Organization/Address: Region 19 ESC 6611 Boeing, El Paso, TX 79925	Telephone: 915-780 5096 Fax: 915-780-5305
	E mail Address: trodriguez@esc19.net Date: 2/26/02

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:

Address:

Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:

Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
1787 Agate Street
5207 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR, 97403-5207
attn: Acquisitions